



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,210	03/04/2002	Shinichi Nishizawa	75120-030-2	6903
25269 DYKEMA GO	7590 03/13/200 SSETT PLLC	EXAMINER		
	QUARE, THIRD FLOO	GUILL, RUSSELL L		
1300 I STREET WASHINGTO	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2123	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/087,210	NISHIZAWA ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Russ Guill	2123			

	Russ Guill	2123	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $4$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	inally set in the final Offi	ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	explanation of .
Claim(s) allowed:	•		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		•
11.   ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:		lod	1/1/27
	( ) P	AUL RODRIGUEZ	3/7/
	CHOEDING	SORY PATENT EXAMINATED TO SORY PATENT EXAMINATED TO SOLUTION OF SO	0

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments appear to change the scope of the claims, and would therefore require further search and/or consideration. Claim 16 now recites kinematics software instead of MARC software. Claim 18 now recites both FEM and kinematics software instead of ADAMS software.

Continuation of 11. Claim 1 was amended to recite, "generating a report of the derived spring design". Claim 1 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not appear to support, "generating a report of the derived spring design".

New claim 24 recites, "displaying the derived spring design". Claim 24 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not appear to support, "displaying the derived spring design".